

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated October 16, 2003, claims 1-20 are pending. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections in light of the amendments above.

Claims 1, 2 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Murdock* (3,906,354). Applicants have amended claims 1, 11 and 16. Each of claims 1, 11 and 16 have been modified to clarify that the first annular electrode and the second annular electrode have outer diameters that are sized to be received within the tube. That is, the first and second electrode have a first outer diameter and the tubular portion has an inner diameter that is the same as the outer diameter electrode so that the electrodes can be received within the tubular portion. The word substantially is used in the claims because there may be threads. However, the electrodes are received within the tube so that generally the electrodes have a reduced diameter than the tube. One advantage of this apparatus is that it takes up little space. That is, the diameter of the whole device is about the same diameter as the tubes to which it connects. This is advantageous in a typically restricted automotive application. Therefore, in light of the amendments to claims 1, 11 and 16, applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 2 is dependent upon claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 3 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Murdock* in view of *Jeter* (3,866,678). Claims 3 and 17 are further limitations of claims 1 and 16, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 4-6, 9, 10, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Murdock* in view of *Colvin* (4,751,466). The *Colvin*

U.S.S.N. 09/682,742

7

201-0006 (FGT 1519 PA)

Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well in view of the comments above with respect to claims 1 and 16.

Claims 7, 8 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Murdock* in view of *Colvin* and in further view of *Carll* (4,786,875). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 8 and 20 are dependent claims and therefore should be allowable with respect to their base claims. Also, the *Carll* reference does not teach or suggest the missing elements of the *Murdock* and *Colvin* references as described above. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider these rejections as well.

Claims 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Murdock* in view of *Jeter* and in further view of *Colvin*. Claim 11 has been modified in a similar manner to claim 1 so that the relationship of the outer diameter of the electrode and the inner diameter of the tube is recited. Applicants respectfully submit that these elements are not taught or suggested in the *Murdock*, *Jeter* and *Colvin* references.

In light of the amendments and remarks, applicants submit that all the rejections are now overcome. The applicants have added no new matter to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ P.C.



Kevin G. Mierzwa, Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: 1/14/04